

Email Sent to Applicant

From: escertification@energystar.gov
Sent: 2017-05-08T16:28:48.000-04:00
To: scarlton@tishmanspeyer.com,
CC: irobinson@rdkengineers.com,
Subject: ENERGY STAR Application for 125 High St. (ID: 4812769)

Dear Steve Carlton:

Thank you for applying for the ENERGY STAR for 125 High St. (ID: 4812769). We have reviewed your application, and we wanted to follow up on the issue below:

This property appears to be a duplicate of another property that earned the ENERGY STAR. The properties are listed below:

- Current Submission: Property ID 4812769: 125 High Street, 125 High Street, Boston, MA 02110
- Last certified in 2015: Property ID 1620815: 125 High Street, 125 High Street, Boston, MA 02110

Duplicate properties can occur in Portfolio Manager when a property is benchmarked multiple times by different users. This often happens when a property is taken over by a new owner or manager. Duplicates are checked for two reasons: 1) to ensure that a property does not receive certification twice in one calendar year and 2) to ensure that a property only has one unique listing on the ENERGY STAR Registry of Certified Buildings.

Are these entries in Portfolio Manager duplicates of the same physical property? Can you explain why they have been tracked in different Portfolio Manager accounts? If they are duplicates, one of the properties must be used as the primary record in the Registry of Certified Buildings, and other certifications would be shown as part of the history for the property. Should the current submission be used as the primary record (that is, will the current account and property ID be used for all future property updates and certification applications)?

Please respond to this email by June 7 if you would like this property to be considered for the ENERGY STAR.

Thank you and we look forward to your response,

ENERGY STAR Certification Review Team

Response from Applicant 5/9/17

Hi Energy Star team,

Thanks for reaching out. Yes, they are duplicates of the same property. I haven't been privy to the whole process, but the account for property ID 4812769 is the account that is kept up to date, and that account should be the primary record.

My guess is that the 4812769 account was created when the property shifted to automated reporting of energy data to Portfolio Manager instead of manual data entry, and at that time Property ID 1620815 was abandoned. Property ID 1620815 is no longer used. Do we need to take any other action to get Property ID 4812679 certified? We are not planning to submit future applications using account 1620815; all future applications should be for account 4812679.

Steve, do you agree with this?

Thanks,

Ian Robinson,